

In Stephen Sondheim's *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum*, Pseudolus, contemplating a flagon of wine, asks, "Was 1 a good year?" For the Council, Year 1, the first year of major State appropriation for the arts, was indeed a vintage year.

Year 2 – which is what 1971-72 represents – was its equal. True, there was a significant drop in the amount of money appropriated for Council distribution – \$5 million, to be exact, or \$2.7 million if one discounts the previous year's special appropriation of \$2.3 million for the New York Public Library. Equally true, there was a significant growth in applications for financial assistance, which – again to be exact – jumped from 850 to 1,216. This awesome double threat to the funding process was faced with purpose and dedication by staff and Council alike. The consequences were that 805 organizations were supported by the Council in Year 2 compared to the 600 supported in Year 1.

Several questions had to be answered, of course, before the Council's funding plan for Year 2 could be brought into focus. The principal one was how to insure appropriate and necessary support to the many organizations "saved" by Council assistance in Year 1 and remain responsive to organizations applying for first-time assistance in Year 2. Balance and selectivity were recognized as the determining factors. Maintaining this balance between support of the established New York State arts resources and the newly applying ones required painstaking scrutiny and perception.

Although a total of 805 organizations received support from the Council under the Local Assistance Act for 1971-72, some received funds for several activities within different disciplines. The table below, which shows the number of organizations assisted by each Council program, therefore reflects interdisciplinary activity to the extent that 938 instances of assistance benefited 805 applicants. In this connection, it is also worth noting that the Special Programs support to arts organizations serving predominantly black and Puerto Rican audiences encompassed a wide range of disciplines. (The 116 Special Programs assistance grants went toward programs in the following disciplines: 1 in film and TV/media, 2 in literature, 14 in dance, 19 in music, 34 in theatre, 17 in the visual arts, and 29 in a combination of art forms.) These figures do not take into account the 573 organizations served by the Council-sponsored Touring Program, Exhibitions, Technical Assistance, Film Speakers Bureau, Visiting Artists, The Composer in Performance, Poets and Writers, and Isolated Communities Program. Nor do they include the numerous organizations represented among the estimated 3,500 inquiries handled by the Council's Information Center.

Year 2 was a vintage year.

Omar K. Lerman

Council program	instances of assistance
Arts Service Organizations	24
Film, TV/Media, Literature	110
Film 57; TV/Media 37; Literature	16
Performing Arts	482
Dance 121; Music 158; Theatre 130;	

Presenting Organizations	73
Special Programs	116
Visual Arts	206
Museum Aid 125; Community Projects	81

The Arts and Government in New York State
a statement by the Executive Director of the New York State Council on the Arts for the
Council's 1971 -72 Annual Report

Earlier this year there was an exchange of letters in an upstate newspaper between a member of the Legislature and one of his constituents, the president of the local art society. The latter was defending government support of the arts against the charge that the arts are a luxury, or only the concern of an elite. Calling the legislator's attention to the officers named on his society's letterhead, he listed their occupations: schoolteacher, plumber, operator of an employment agency, wife of an electrical contractor, school administrator, wife of a printer, blacksmith, wife of a doctor, and so on. "Very enlightening," he added, "and the rest of our membership runs the same way — not one professional artist, but all very much involved, everyone finding a chance for much personal meaning and happiness; and to them it is not a frill, but a very important part of their lives."

"In this time of financial crisis for our state," the legislator replied, "I believe it to be most unjust that millions of small taxpayers are forced to help subsidize activities in which they have no interest, and in many cases are much opposed to. I have no objection to people who want to indulge in such activities, but I don't think the general public ought to pay for it. We have far more pressing needs such as schools, hospitals, and highways, and money must be found to carry on the essential programs rather than diverting funds for programs which may be enjoyable, but are certainly not essential."

One could scarcely ask for a clearer contrast between the opposing views that the arts are or are not properly a public concern, or a clearer indication of the fact that the very idea of state funding for the arts is so new that challenges to it are still fundamental — whether it should in fact exist, whether among the competing priorities of a sorely stretched society the arts rank high enough to merit support from the taxpayers. It is important that these questions be asked, for an agency of government, if it is not to go stale, must be subject to constant scrutiny and criticism; and the New York State Council on the Arts — which this year administered an appropriation of over \$14 million to support arts organizations and to make their resources more available to the public — is no exception.

The purpose of the New York State Council on the Arts, is to provide the people of the State with services they desire but could not, for reasons that are primarily economic, otherwise obtain. It does this in large degree by funding in part, but only in part, the operations of many hundreds of organizations which, taken together, compose the sector labeled "non-profit arts" in the economy of the State. That is to say, they constitute an industry, and one which further stimulates other forms of business and industrial activity. But it is also somewhat peculiar, since it is essentially a handicraft industry which is undercapitalized and has hitherto sustained itself

by relying on private patronage and by systematically underpaying its personnel. It can no longer do so.

The services provided by the arts organizations of the State take a wide variety of forms, ranging from music to museum exhibits, poetry to film, finance to drama, opera to sculpture, literature to multimedia – in short the full spectrum of means by which men and women, in every time and place, have tried to add meaning and value to their lives. The arts are among the oldest human enterprises of which we have record. We know of no society which has not triven – in color and sound and shape and word and gesture – io pin down in permanent form its feelings and highest aspirations. If the arts in New York State were not regarded as valid and necessary by a substantial and widely distributed number of its citizens, the Council could not and should not exist.

New York State has the largest concentration of cultural resources in the nation. It has three major symphony orchestras – in Buffalo, Rochester, and New York – and in the years since World War II New York City has become the international capital of music. It is the theatre capital, generating plays which are now performed everywhere in the world. It is also the dance capital for both classical and modern dance and something close to the painting capita] as well. New York State's museums are world-renowned and, together with historical societies, they number over five hundred. The arts are what New York is noted for – as Texas is for oil, or iowa for corn. Without its cultural institutions, as Governor Rockefeller has said, this would not be the Empire State.

When the term "arts" is used, moreover, it should always be remembered that this is no bloodless abstraction, but an endless range of living, immediate experience. The arts deal with the human ability to perceive and feel – deal with it, indeed, in the most organized and powerful way we know. They deal with human emotion, with every possible combination of pity and fear and anger and laughter. They deal above all else with pleasure, because they appeal directly to the senses of seeing and hearing and tactile feeling.

Such direct, vital contact between the arts and their public is what keeps them alive, and readers of this annual report will therefore find throughout it an emphasis on the purpose to which public monies have been put, the service provided. The mandate of the Council from the Governor and the Legislature is, among other things, to preserve the artistic heritage of the State, but not by putting it in dead storage, as though in a bank vault. Rather, the Council has been enjoined to make the State's cultural resources more accessible and available, and to larger and broader audiences. For if the arts can be "saved" in our time, they can only be saved by making them an integral part of everyone's daily life, a natural and legitimate activity which does not constantly need to be justified and apologized for.

Paradoxically, those like the members of the upstate art society, for whom the arts are already "a very important part of their lives," sometimes end up agreeing with skeptics like their legislator who think the arts are the concern only of those "who want to indulge in such activities." For those who care about them the arts are their own justification – which is one reason why we defend them so badly, and why some people still regard them as unnecessary. A commitment to the arts is usually made early and irreversibly. There will have been that

moment when the glowing colors on the canvas, the unfolding intentions of the playwright, or the intricate interplay of chord and melody demonstrated their power to engage not merely the mind but the entire being. The poet A. E. Housman once said that he could not let a line of poetry come into his head while shaving, since the gooseflesh it caused made him unable to continue.

The satisfaction of the senses, that is, is supposed to be self-sufficient. We are assumed to be happy with what we have got, just as the artist is assumed to derive such ineffable rewards from his work that he need not be paid a living wage. The legislator's view is essentially the same as that of the minority which used to think of the arts (as a few, unhappily, still do) as their private domain, bought and paid for. With this attitude went a tone of hushed reverence before the masterpiece, to make it clear the cognoscenti knew something you didn't, which effectively drove away whatever members of the general public had not already been antagonized by pure snobbery.

We are still suffering from this inward-looking complacency, but its days are numbered. What has happened is nothing less than a revolution, a radical transformation in the relationship between art and society in the United States. What was once peripheral and functionally dispensable is now central and essential. What we have witnessed, as Alvin Toffler put it in *The Culture Consumers* in 1964, is a conversion "from cult to culture" – from a minority preoccupation to a major phenomenon permeating the whole society. The nonprofit arts (to use that ugly phrase again) have achieved a social and economic importance so far in excess of their traditional role that our cultural institutions, our systems for supporting them, and – perhaps most of all – our ideas about them are still struggling to catch up.

The many factors which brought this about are familiar: the sustained prosperity of the American middle class, the increase in leisure time, the wider availability of higher education, the growing concern with the quality of life. In combination they have filled the museums with crowds; stimulated the building of new theatres and art centers; brought into existence thousands of new music ensembles, theatre groups, and dance companies; and multiplied the sales of books, phonograph records, painting materials, and musical instruments, in the process they have permanently altered the conditions within which the artist works.

His audience, for one thing, is now enormous. Formerly the major leisure activities outside the home were assumed to be movies and sports, but that is no longer the case. An independent study of arts organizations in New York State for the year 1970-71 conducted by the National Research Center of the Arts (an affiliate of Louis Harris and Associates) confirmed earlier Council staff estimates of huge statewide attendance at arts events. While in the past three years attendance for all professional sports and college basketball has remained stable at about 23 million and the figures for movies have stood at no more than 110 million, those for the nonprofit arts have been increasing appreciably each year. If present trends continue, it is thoroughly possible that in five years the arts audience will be greater than those of sports and movies combined.

The economic impact is no less staggering. The National Research Center survey included independent, nonprofit cultural organizations from all disciplines whose annual budgets are more than \$5,000. These 543 organizations showed total expenditures of \$184 million, covering

not only their payrolls but goods and services in their communities ranging from general contracting, printing, advertising and public relations, legal and accounting consultation, cleaning and maintenance, security, mailing and postage, to paper, wood, liability insurance, costumes, cosmetics, and all the materials and equipment necessary to their work. A conservative estimate of the total of these expenditures for 1970-71 is \$23,272,800, of which about \$6.5 million went to construction activities such as carpentry, plumbing, electrical work, etc., and \$3.1 million to printing alone.

Most noteworthy of all in the National Research Center figures is the function of government money. State support of the nonprofit arts is unusual in that it stimulates vastly larger support from other sources, accomplishes much with little, and is amply returned to the people in the further economic activity it generates. State government support for the arts in New York is exceptional in that the organizations to which it goes receive \$15 in income from other sources for each State tax dollar spent. Furthermore, State funding of these same 543 organizations was \$8.8 million, or slightly less than 5 per cent of their total expenditures, and since they spent more than \$23 million on goods and services, then the State's subsidy was returned to its economy three times over.

Another point too seldom remembered is the economic dependence of commerce and industry on the resources, services, and stimulus of the nonprofit arts for which no charge is made. An obvious example is the connection between the tourist trades in New York State—the hotel, motel, restaurant, taxi, automobile, gasoline, and souvenir business—and the cultural institutions and activities which draw tourists to the State in the first place. But note also that the two major industries of New York City—fashion and communications—are there, and will stay there at some cost to themselves, because they have to, because only there can be found the ideas and energy on which they depend.

Can anyone imagine industrial design in this country, over the past quarter century, without the design collection of The Museum of Modern Art? Can anyone imagine the \$12.5 billion advertising industry without a continual supply—from museums and performing arts centers and from independent writers, painters, musicians, and filmmakers whom it presently does not pay—of the verbal, graphic, musical and cinematic raw material which it indefatigably consumes? In the words of the National Research Center's report, "Few industries with such modest capital and manpower served so many with so much as the arts and cultural industry in 1970-71"—and, one might add, for so little.

Why, then, is state support necessary? It is needed, first of all, because the arts in a modern, industrial-scientific nation operate at a built-in economic disadvantage. They are not able to modernize, as industry can modernize, by using the techniques of mass production. The arts must deal with objects and experiences one by one: the painter paints one painting at a time, the musician must play each piece as though he were just creating it. The result is what Mr. Toffler calls the Law of Inefficiency in Art—namely, that every increase in the technological effectiveness of society puts the arts at a greater relative disadvantage, industry can pay higher wages because its productivity can increase, but those who work in the arts—and who also want cars, and decent housing, and fringe benefits—find themselves linked to institutions which, technologically and economically, cannot move. The glory of the arts, which is their

individual humanity and uniqueness, becomes their fatal flaw. They are fixed in place while the rest of the world advances. The result has become a system of self-perpetuating poverty.

Someone has very properly observed that art has always been subsidized in this country; it has been subsidized by the artists themselves. The notion that they will do better work if they starve in a garret has turned out to die hard. Artists are constantly being asked to donate their services, for example, presumably on the grounds that if they didn't regard money as demeaning they wouldn't be artists. It was also once said that the greatest single piece of legislation for the arts in America has been the Unemployment Compensation Act; until very recently dance companies notoriously scheduled their seasons so that dancers could get maximum unemployment insurance. The same survey of 543 New York State organizations showed that the average income of their administrative directors – usually the highest paid of all staff members – was \$10,203, or less than half the average salary of the State's top level business executives or the average income of its doctors and lawyers.

The arts, moreover, are no different from the many other forms of human endeavor which have proved to be unable to pay their way in a free market. No one could afford education, if we had to pay what it really costs; no one could afford transportation, if we had to pay what it really costs. One by one – along with recreation, conservation, historic preservation, and the like – activities once thought to be the province of private enterprise have passed over into the public sector. Even private industry itself, when disaster strikes, has been known to ask government for subsidy lest jobs be lost or vital functions curtailed. Similarly, without state aid, many arts organizations would go out of existence or restrict their services. The arts are only the most recent, and the most unfamiliar, to join the list. Government support of them can be thought of as a high-performance additive, if you like – the margin of excellence and availability.

Coming as late as we have, the New York State Council on the Arts has tried to apply the lessons learned by those who have preceded us in the experience of administering government support. We have tried to avoid formulas, to retain both flexibility and the power to make decisions on a basis of quality. It is a relatively new thing in government to allocate funds according to value judgments, and being new it is not always very very well understood or accepted. Not everyone is pleased by the results. A former State official who is one of the Council's most valued advisors remarked not long ago that he had at last discovered what our job was. "What you are supposed to do," he said, "is systematically distribute dissatisfaction around the State on an unequal basis." He has a point.

In other words, because we try to make the money count, to put each dollar where it will do the most good, the Council has to risk the unpopularity of saying No. Council policy is never to be the sole support of any organization and, under the terms of our appropriation act, we are required to ask applicants what they propose doing to secure income from other sources. We are also vitally interested in the strategies of their growth, in helping them be strong both artistically and administratively. We try to be sensitive to their problems, respectful of their priorities, interested in their affairs.

The Council responds, essentially, to an application form in which an organization states its needs. This will be judged according to guidelines set forth in broad terms by the Legislature

and refined by discussions between the Council and the Division of the Budget, namely: the area and population to be reached, the quality of the program, the degree of public service, the amount of income or the lack of it, and the ability of the organization to do what it proposes to do. Among these criteria the emphasis will vary, but normally a total failure to meet a given one of them would be disqualifying. That is to say, a small, private museum might meet every standard of excellence, but if it offered no public service there would be little justification to help maintain it with public funds.

The money can go for many things: to mount exhibits, put on productions, pay salaries, conduct workshops, hold poetry readings, provide technical assistance, play concerts, set up summer festivals, create new works, and so on and on. Sometimes, though only in special circumstances, it simply serves to support overall operating expenses. In general, the purposes intended are three: (1) to identify, conserve, or sustain a cultural resource, (2) to develop a resource through controlled growth, and (3) to bring new resources into existence through innovation and creativity. Behind all three is very plainly the aim of maintaining and increasing the health and well-being of the arts in New York State.

To keep these varied factors and implements in balance is, putting it mildly, a complex task; In order to keep the process of judgment open and responsible, we try to share it around among a number of people; usually over thirty will be involved in evaluating a single application, of whom at least a third will have had experience in the field at issue. There will be review by the Council staff, both artistic and fiscal, then by a panel of outside professionals, and finally by the Council itself, which consists of fifteen citizens known for their distinction and interest in the arts, who are appointed by the Governor (with the consent of the Senate) and serve without pay for five-year terms. No allocation of funds is authorized without the Council's approval, and its decisions are of course final.

Though in fact there was an earlier arts council — the Utah Art Institute, founded in 1899 — the New York State Council on the Arts developed during the first dozen years of its existence on the assumption that there were no precedents. Its techniques evolved on pragmatic, empirical terms; what we are still doing is what turned out to work. The Council has not so much a philosophy as many philosophies, for there are few rules which will work in all cases. Arts organizations are so various, their situations so different, the range so great from the large to the small, that no single approach would be effective.

Moreover, in the Council's experience, what appear to be conflicting alternatives are often nothing of the kind. Large and small institutions, for example, are not adversaries but partners. Innovative and sustaining programs are not opposed, but necessary, to one another. The amateur uses the professional to learn from and the professional uses the amateur to recruit from. Excellence and equity are not irreconcilable ideals. And it is true in the arts, if not always elsewhere, that New York City and the rest of the State have a fruitful interrelationship. In each of these polarities there is constant and reciprocal action, flowing both ways. It might even be argued that the reason the avant-garde prospers in New York is that it has the Establishment to be angry at.

The Council's aim, therefore, is quite literally to act on each application one at a time, according to its merits, in terms of the programs proposed, as the conditions of the present

moment require. Funding is not automatic and cannot be guaranteed from year to year. In the first place, the Legislature quite properly would not permit such a thing and, in the second, the Council's appropriation may vary from one year to the next. Also, the climate within the arts community may change; a particular art form may at one moment seem more in need of aid than another. And, lastly, the economic health of a given organization may fluctuate; it may suddenly be in trouble, as are many in the Southern Tier which were devastated by the flood, or it may – equally suddenly – have received a large benefaction (though in the latter case, to be sure, the Council tries not to penalize an organization for its enterprise or good fortune).

What, then, does the Council look for? It looks above all for quality. Since it cannot sustain every artistic endeavor in the State, it must restrict itself to aiding those of more than recreational and sentimental value. Since it is charged with the economic future of the arts in New York, it must before all else have a care for those whose level of ability is such that they can make the arts their primary, full-time concern – that is, who are professionals. Second, it looks for vitality. Since it hopes to see its own money multiply many times over, it seeks out those self-generating activities and individuals who need only marginal assistance, a leg up to get them over the top. Third, it looks for continuity. Since, ultimately, the Council should make itself as unnecessary as possible, it hopes to discover those measures which will preserve and increase that pluralistic contribution to the arts from business and private patrons by which its own influence can be kept from getting out of hand.

The Council stands midway between the world of the arts and the world of government; it is the ambassador and interpreter of each to the other. "Your problem," a wise New York State newspaperman has said, "is that you have to face in two directions at once. From one side you have to look like a bunch of certified public accountants, and from the other like you're really with it – and sometimes you get caught facing the wrong way." True enough, but that slight embarrassment is small price to pay for the privilege of bringing together, on the one hand the unexampled power of government to improve the lives of its citizens, and on the other the unexampled power of the arts to make those lives worth living.

What the New York State Council on the Arts most definitely does not wish to see itself become is a paper-heavy organization largely dedicated to its own self-preservation, for in an ideal universe all bureaucracies (and, like it or not, we are bureaucrats) should self-destruct occasionally and start all over. Nor does it have the objective of "creating" art, which would be arrogant and presumptuous. The role of an arts council – as we understand it – should rather be thought of as ecological: to prepare the conditions in which art could occur; to clear the aesthetic air and water, to nourish the cultural soil. The society which resulted would be one in which no person wanting the sustenance to mind and psyche that the arts provide would be denied it, in which neither rural isolation nor urban poverty would be a bar to drawing on the artistic resources of the State, in which artists themselves would no longer be economically second-class citizens. It would be a society in which the arts would be valued for what they are, an essential component of a balanced existence and a thriving culture, and would take their proper place, not on the edges of life in New York State, but at its very center.

Eric Larrabee

New York State Council on the Arts Annual Report 1971-72

This entry is derived from the 1971-72 New York State Council on the Arts Annual report. It contains images related to film and media, funding by the film and television program, and support of media by other programs.

* means that the organization received support from at least one other program at NYSCA. The organizations receiving media support which received help for a media-related project from another program are listed following the Media listing.

Film, TV/Media, Literature

In 1970-71 the much enlarged legislative appropriation for the Council allowed initial support for television, video, and media projects as well as increased assistance in connection with film showings, filmmaking, poetry, and literature. The number and kinds of such activities made possible by Council support continued to increase and diversify in 1971-72.

In regard to film, it was a year when more people than perhaps ever before had opportunities to experience the medium's extraordinary variety through programming at centers that ranged from the Circle Film Forum and the Millennium Film Workshop to the Whitney Museum of American Art, and through organizations as varied as the Film Society of Lincoln Center, statewide public library systems, and the Plattsburgh Film Society. It was a year of unusually productive filmmaking achieved through the Media Equipment Resource Center.

It was a year when experimentation and exploration by independent video artists was freed from closed-circuit systems in out-of-the-way places and began to reach broad audiences by coaxial cable. The Council's activity as one of the few sources of aid for such research and development, and the growth of interest in TV's unexplored potential combined to increase requests for assistance far beyond its means, but commitment to independent television and public television continued in a substantial and significant manner.

It was a year in which public New York State appearances and workshop participation by writers and poets more than doubled as did the audiences for them, and one in which especially strong Council support was given to the imaginative work of the Teachers and Writers Collaborative and the St. Mark's Church In-the-Bowery Poetry Project. Small circulation magazines again received aid from the Council's grant to the Coordinating Council of Literary Magazines in 1971-72, rounding out a support program that affected both creative accomplishment in and broadened public acquaintance with the communication arts.

Peter Bradley

Film

The striking and sometimes startling diversity of our movies' past was made accessible to New Yorkers across the State in record magnitude this year as noncommercial film organizations sought to present examples of the best work done in the relatively brief (seventy-five-year) history of the medium—from early silent classics to the most recent films of contemporary artists. Recognizing the growth of audiences that are serious about movies, a few commercial movie houses also joined in this counter-thrust to prevalent practice and instituted repertory programming on the basis of lasting quality rather than immediate topicality.

A variety of Council grants played a major part in this development, making possible among other things the Ninth New York Film Festival, the First International Festival of Women's Films, and the year-round programs of the Circle Film Forum.

Throughout the State, library systems received grants to expand their collections of 16mm feature films, and three such systems shared their film collections to provide even greater diversity for their constituents. With encouragement from the Council-supported Greater Middletown Arts Council, the distinguished Bown Adams collection of silent films was projected for Middletown area audiences at the State Hospital and for senior citizens and high school students. In western New York, film enthusiasts had opportunities to see movies and hear filmmakers through a Council grant to Media Study, Inc. of Buffalo, and eminent teachers including Bruce Baillie, Stan Brakhage, Ed Emshwiller, Richard Leacock, and Stan VanDerBeek participated in "image making" workshops sponsored by the same group. In Rochester the International Film Festival—a critical success but in financial difficulty after its first year—was enabled to sustain activity.

At the same time, the Council continued support for the creation of films by grants to film workshops and by making film equipment available to community groups and institutions on free short term loan. Administered by the Young Filmmakers' Foundation, the loan program (known as MERC—the Media Equipment Resource Center) has benefited more than a hundred organizations and individual filmmakers in the first nine months of its existence. With Council support, the Young Filmmaker's Foundation continued to expand its varied media programs for young people, which have been models for organizations throughout the nation.

Through the Film Speakers Bureau, which provides schools, libraries, and film societies with matching funds up to \$300 for rental of films and up to \$150 for appearances by film speakers, the Council continued statewide support of educational activities to foster film appreciation. The Bureau's purview was expanded this year to include fees for artists working in video to demonstrate and speak about their work. Rental of videotapes also received partial support. A detailed report on Film Speakers Bureau activity follows the listing of film assistance.

Barbara Haspiel

Film assistance in 1971-72

The American Museum of Natural History, New York City. \$25,000 for the development of a multiple-screen film by Francis Thompson on the worldwide environmental crisis.*

Bay Area Friends of the Fine Arts. Bayport. \$300 for rental fees for an international film series.*

Brooklyn Arts and Culture Association (BACA). \$1,830 for film stock and processing for teenage workshops in Bay Ridge and Bensonhurst.*

Center for Understanding Media, New York City. \$13,600 for an expanded program of short films shown at the Children's Film Theater to study child reactions, and for a study of films being produced in secondary schools in New York State.

Chautauqua-Cattaraugus Library System, Jamestown. \$17,951 for the salary of a film librarian, and for the expansion of a film rental program.

The Children's Art Carnival, New York City. \$1,569 for teachers' salaries and operating costs of a young people's workshop in animation and still photography. The Carnival is sponsored by The Museum of Modern Art.*

Columbia County Council on the Arts, Chatham. \$300 for the continuation of a community film series.*

The Community, A Free School, Willow. \$3,000 for a teacher's salary, materials, and equipment rental for a children's film and video workshop.*

Council on the Arts for Clinton-Essex Counties, Plattsburgh. \$300 for rental of feature-length and short films for the Plattsburgh Film Society.*

Earlville Opera House. \$6,525 for the salary of a director and operating costs of a film and video workshop for teen-agers, adults, and senior citizens.*

George Eastman House, Rochester. \$4,750 for a study and symposium on the effect of sound on the development of the film.*

Educational Film Library Association, New York City. \$15,000 for the expansion of the statewide services of their film information center.

Everson Museum of Art, Syracuse. \$700 for rentals for a film series and appearances by filmmakers.*

The Film Making Project, Babylon. \$1,000 for the expansion of a Super-8 workshop for children, teenagers, and adults.

The Film Society of Lincoln Center, New York City. \$38,500 for production expenses for the ninth New York Film Festival and the 1971 season of Movies in the Park.

Film Speakers Bureau, New York City. \$35,000 for a program providing matching funds for rental of films and videotapes and fees for lectures on video, films, and filmmaking presented at libraries, museums, and other community centers throughout the State.

Friends of the Lakeview Library, Rockville Centre. \$325 for film rentals.*

Greater Middletown Arts Council. \$1,600 for operating costs of a festival of classic silent films and a mobile film series presented at the Middletown State Hospital, the Area Nursing Home, and the Senior Citizen Center.*

The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York City. \$2,000 for the salary of a curator to plan a three-week film retrospective and prepare an illustrated catalog of the program.*

Hamilton-Madison House, New York City. \$2,500 for the continuation of a filmmaking workshop for young people.*

Henry Street Settlement, New York City. \$14,450 for the salaries of a director and assistant director of filmmaking workshops for young children and teenagers.*

Hudson River Museum at Yonkers. \$7,000 for operating costs for the continuation of a filmmaking workshop for inner city teenagers.*

Institute of New Cinema Artists, New York City. \$10,000 for administrative costs and the salary of a director of an apprenticeship program developed in cooperation with Third World Cinema Productions.

International Film Seminar, New York City. \$1,050 for scholarships for students and teachers attending the annual Robert Flaherty Film Seminar.

Kenan Center, Lockport. \$500 for a community film series.*

Kirkland Art Center, Clinton., \$450 for an instructor's salary and for film stock and processing expenses for a children's workshop.*

The Loft Film and Theatre Center, Bronxville. \$14,100 for staff salaries for a film workshop for young people, and for a Super-8 research project.

Emily Lowe Gallery, Hofstra University, Hempstead. \$170 for film rentals for a community film series.*

Lyceum, Saranac Lake. \$850 for the expansion of a film series for students and children at North Country Community College.*

Media Study, Inc., Buffalo. \$20,493 for establishing a media center for Buffalo and western New York State including salaries of a director and a producer, fees for film and media artists-in-

residence, and operating and equipment expenses; and for production expenses for a film presentation on the life and art of D. W. Griffith, produced and directed by Arthur Barren.*

The Metropolitan Area Council for International Recreation, Culture and Lifelong Education, New York City. \$11,000 for the salary of a director of film programs, and for film rental fees at the Circle Film Forum.*

Mid-Hudson Libraries, Poughkeepsie. \$11,000 for long-term leasing of feature films for the use of member libraries.

Mid-York Library System, Utica. \$11,000 for longterm leasing of feature films for the use of member libraries, and for the expansion of a 16mm classic feature film collection.

Millbrook Community Center, East Side House Settlement, Bronx. \$2,000 for instructors' salaries, and for film stock and processing expenses for a community filmmaking workshop.

Millennium Film Workshop, New York City. \$20,000 for administrative salaries and filmmaker's fees for the continuation of a creative film workshop and public showings for new films.

Mohawk Valley Library Association, Schenectady. \$7,500 for rental of films shown by member libraries and expansion of a 16mm film collection.

Grandma Moses Cultural Center, Hoosick Falls. \$1,000 for film rentals, and for the salary of a director of a film series and seminar.*

Narcotics Education Workshop of Westbury. \$5,000 for the salary of a film teacher and for film stock and processing expenses for the continuation of a young people's filmmaking workshop.

Nassau Library System, Garden City. \$4,000 for long-term leasing of feature films.

New York University School of the Arts, New York City. \$5,100 for administrative costs and for honoraria for student filmmakers participating in film seminars in six upstate communities.*

Nineteenth Ward Community Association, Rochester. \$10,352 for salaries and for film stock and processing expenses for the continuation of a filmmaking workshop for inner city youth.

North Shore Community Arts Center, Great Neck. \$400 for operating costs of a film series.*

The Alexander Robertson School, New York City. \$525 matching funds for long-term leasing of films for the West Side Film Teachers Cooperative.

Rochester International Film Festival. \$15,000 for administrative and fund raising expenses.

Sage Hill Camp, New York City. \$600 for operating costs of summer film workshop activities.

South Shore Cultural Arts Center, Point Lookout. \$1,100 for operating costs for the continuation of a filmmaking workshop.*

The Studio Museum in Harlem, New York City. \$7,670 for the costs of a filmmaking workshop.*

Troy Public Library. \$500 for film rentals for a children's film series.*

Upper Hudson Library Federation, Albany. \$5,000 for operating costs for the continuation of a film and videotape workshop for inner city youth.

Wantagh 7-12 Association. \$2,000 for salaries and supplies for an artists-in-residence project.*

Westchester Library System, White Plains. \$4,000 for the rental of feature-length films for the use of member libraries.

Whitney Museum of American Art, New York City. \$4,800 for fees for filmmakers whose films were shown in the New American Filmmakers Series.*

Women's Interart Center, New York City. \$7,500 for the salaries of a film workshop teacher and the director and coordinator of the First International Festival of Women's Films.*

Young Filmmaker's Foundation, New York City. \$92,575 for salaries and administrative costs of the Foundation's statewide programs; and for equipment and the salaries of a director and an assistant for the Media Equipment Resource Center.

Youth Film Distribution Center, New York City. \$9,000 for the salaries of a director and a secretary to continue film distribution and arrange a young people's film festival.

YWCA of Buffalo and Erie County. \$7,100 for salaries, film stock, and processing expenses for the continuation of the Channel of Soul film workshop.

YWCA of Peekskill. \$1,500 for the salary of a parttime film teacher, film stock, and processing expenses for a workshop for young people.

Film and videotape rentals assisted in 1971-72 by the Film Speakers Bureau

Numbers following institution names indicate more than one instance of assistance.

Albany

Friends of the Albany Public Library

Annandale-on-Hudson

Bard College/2

Baldwin

South Shore YM-YWHA

Clifton Park

Clifton Park-Half moon Area Jaycees

Earlville

Earlville Booster Club

Florida

Synechia Arts Center

Huntington Station

Holy Family Diocesan High School

Nanuet

St. Agatha School

New Rochelle

Iona College

New York City

The Bernard M. Baruch College of the City University of New York/2; The Chapin School; The City College of the City University of New York/2; Hunter College of the City University of New York/2; The Lenox School; Movies in the Park/5; New York University Institute of Film and Television/2

Rhinebeck

Upstate Films

Rochester

The Harley School

Scotia

New York State Art Teachers Association/2

Wilson

Wilson Central Schools

Yorktown Heights

BOCES

Speakers' appearances arranged and assisted in 1971-72 by the Film Speakers Bureau

Numbers following speakers' names indicate multiple appearances at one institution.

Albany

Arbor Hill Community Center (/err/ Brace, Michael Rutherford, Cindy Stump, She/don Taylor); New York State Youth Film/Media Show (Patricia Bellantoni, Dan DiNicola, David lackier, lohn Lidstone)

Baldwin

South Shore YM-YWHA (Leonard Herman/8)

Binghamton

Experimental TV Center (Ange/ Nunez, Abby Schwartz/2)

Burnt Hills

Burnt Hills-Ballston Lake PTA Council (Dan DiNicola/7, Lorraine Madrisk/2)

Chatham

Columbia County Council on the Arts (Fred Silva/3)

Earlville

Earlville Opera House (Howard Finch/2, Robert Oliver/2)

Middletown

Orange County Community College (DeeDee Halleck); Orange County Fair (Nancy Cain, Chris Emanuel/2, Linda Halcotf, DeeDee Halleck/2, Betty Kratzenstein)

New York City

The City College of the City University of New York (Ernie Gehr); The New York Public Library Video Workshop (Bill Sloan/8); New York University (Charlotte Moorman/3); New York University Institute of Film and Television (Stan Brakhage, Hollis Frampton, Ernie Gehr, Michael Snow); Public Access Celebration (Tom Bigornca, Mike Frank, Steve Fuller, Howie Gutstadt, Mollie Hughes, Phyllis Johnson, Phoebe Kaylor, Ben Levine, Charles Levine, James Smith, Bill Stevens); Women's Interart Center (Susan Kleckner/3)

Woodstock

Whiz Bang Quick City (Ra/ph Arlych/2)

Yorktown Heights

BOCES (Vincent Clarkin/4)

TV/Media

In 1971-72 the Council continued its previous encouragement of the growth of what has been called "video literacy," enabling workshops throughout the State to provide training for artists and community groups in the use of portable videotape systems as a medium for expression and communication. The diversity of groups receiving such assistance in itself suggests new and effective uses for the video medium, and several have now directed their energies toward programming for cable television, particularly through the public access channels provided by New York City's two franchised cable companies. National attention is focused on these channels as models on which municipal regulation of cable television might ultimately be based.

Council support to public television this year aided in the creation of a thirteen-week arts series called Carousel, with each weekly component originating in a different part of the State. The series also served to link the seven member stations of the New York Network in their first major cooperative enterprise, with each station receiving funds for the production of one or more half-hour color programs and all stations presenting the entire series.

The Artist's Television Workshop at WNET, Channel 13 in New York City, founded in 1970-71 with Council support and subsequently expanded with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation to become the experimental Television Laboratory, received continued Council support in 1971-72 in response to artists' interest in access to sophisticated color television facilities and the station's desire to enrich broadcast television.

Russell Connor

TV/Media assistance in 1971-72

American Crafts Council, New York City. \$2,800 for video installations at crafts exhibitions and maintenance of video equipment.*

The Block of 7th Street Media Project, New York City. \$19,986 for continuation of media workshops, an afternoon program for teen-agers, videotape and equipment expenses, assistance in fund raising, and salaries of one coordinator, three associate coordinators, and three junior associates.

Broadway Local, New York City. \$2,000 for portable video equipment for community events.

The Brooklyn Museum. \$6,000 for a feasibility study of museum arts programs for public television.*

Center for the Study of Social Change, New York City. \$25,000 for a videotape documentary and a written report on the development of video as a means of social expression and as a creative art form.

Cornell University, Collaborations in Art, Science and Technology, Ithaca. \$20,000 for continuation of art and technology programs and a multimedia poetry tour, cable TV productions, general administration, and the salary of a director.

Educational Broadcasting Corporation (WNET, Channel 13) New York City. \$69,200 for continuation of the Artist's Television Workshop as the experimental Television Laboratory including equipment expenses and salaries of an administrator-technician and artist-in-residence Nam June Paik, and for program production for the Council-sponsored Carousel series.

The Educational Television Council of Central New York (WCNY, Channel 24), Syracuse. \$26,350 for program production for the Council-sponsored Carousel series including the series opening, closing, and transitional sequences, and for a helical scan color videotape recorder for duplication of Council-supported programs and general studio

Electronic Arts Intermix, New York City. \$35,300 for salaries and equipment expenses for three multimedia programs.

Experimental Television Center, Binghamton. \$12,248 for the design and construction of the Paik-Abe video synthesizer for use by public television stations and individual video artists.

Experiments in Art and Technology, New York City. \$4,550 for production of thirteen half-hour experimental videotape programs for public access television.

The Finch College Museum of Art, New York City. \$10,160 for salaries of video photographers and a projectionist, artist honoraria, and travel, equipment, and videotape expenses for a six-week videotape exhibition.

Global Village Video Resource Center, New York City. \$15,000 for continuation of community-oriented video workshops, salaries of two consultants and four production assistants, equipment expenses, and editing facilities for community groups.*

Intermedia Institute, New York City. \$40,000 for eight productions in an evening multimedia series involving electronic music, computer films, videotape, and video projection, and for the salaries of a director and an administrative assistant.

Long Island Educational Television Council (WLIW, Channel 21), Garden City. \$21,350 for program production for the Council-sponsored Carousel series, and for a helical scan color videotape recorder for duplication of Council-supported programs and general studio use.

Media Bus, Lanesville. \$15,000 for continuation of a mobile community video workshop in upstate New York, and for salaries of artist-technicians.*

Media Study, Inc., Buffalo. \$12,643 for establishing a media center for Buffalo and western New York State including salaries of a director and a producer, fees for film and media artists-in-residence, and operating and equipment expenses.*

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City. \$16,453 matching funds for the production of a pilot color broadcast videotape program on the Museum's collections.*

Mohawk-Hudson Council on Educational Television (WMHT, Channel 17), Schenectady. \$21,350 for program production for the Council-sponsored Carousel series, and for a helical scan color videotape recorder for duplication of Council-supported programs and general studio use.

New School for Social Research, New York City. \$14,700 for a report on the feasibility of live production neighborhood facilities for cable television, prototypes of software to be produced in cooperation with Global Village Video Resource Center, and equipment expenses.

New York University, The Media Co-op, New York City. \$5,000 for honoraria, transportation, salaries of a director and six aides, and thirty hours of videotaping, editing, and copying in connection with a conference to build community participation in media.

Open Channel, New York City. \$14,000 for community consultants and videotape and equipment expenses to support a community cable television facility in New York City.

People's Video Theatre, New York City. \$18,000 for continuation of community television programming, and for salaries of three video directors, a video technician, and an administrator.

Port Washington Public Library. \$14,000 for the continuation of an experimental project in the community use of media including the salaries of the project director and a special project facilitator.

Priority One of Greater Syracuse. \$3,000 for continuation of multimedia productions dealing with community issues.

The Raindance Foundation, New York City. \$19,500 for continuation of the quarterly Radical Software, community programs for cable television, and the salaries of five staff members.

Rochester Area Educational Television Association (WXXI, Channel 21), Rochester. \$21,350 for program production for the Council-sponsored Carousel series, and for a helical scan color videotape recorder for duplication of Council-supported programs and general studio use.

Rochester Museum and Science Center. \$15,000 for continuation of a video equipment pool including administrative costs, overhead, salaries, tape, equipment, and maintenance.*

Sonic Arts Union, Stony Point. \$5,000 for continuation of multimedia concerts.*

Southern Tier Educational Television Association (WSKC, Channel 46), Binghamton. \$21,350 for program production for the Council-sponsored Carousel series, and for a helical scan color videotape recorder for duplication of Council-supported programs and general studio use.

The Space for Innovative Development, New York City. \$38,400 for salaries of a director-administrator and a production director for the Space Videoarts division, general administration, a pilot project in non-urban cable television to be conducted by Paul Ryan as artist-in-residence, and equipment and production expenses.*

Elaine Summers Experimental Intermedia Foundation, New York City. \$14,000 for continuation of experimental intermedia productions and for video experimentation in dance and theatre.*

Supernova of the Arts, New York City. \$14,000 for continuation of workshops in photography, silk screen, poetry, sound, and children's art, and for general administration and supplies.

The United Presbyterian Church, Division of Mass Media, New York City. \$6,750 for ten trainees participating in cable television workshops, sponsored by the Office of Cultural Minority Programming.

Video Access, New York City. \$6,300 for videotaping multimedia workshops organized by the Museum of the City of New York, salaries of a video program director and an assistant, and equipment expenses.

Visual Studies Workshop, Rochester. \$15,000 for artists' fees for the continuation of a visiting artists multimedia program, and for the establishment of a research center with a library of audiotapes, films, and videotapes.*

Western New York Educational Television Association (WNED, Channel 17), Buffalo. \$21,350 for program production for the Council-sponsored Carousel series, and for a helical scan color videotape recorder for duplication of Council-supported programs and general studio use.

New York State Council on the Arts Annual Report 1971-72

Other Programs Supporting Media Projects

The listings under each program area are selected from the NYSCA final report. We have not included projects where it was not clear that media was integrated into the project, or where media was used solely as an informational or documentary technique or a transmission medium

for another art form. Some of the descriptions have been excerpted, indicated by brackets; activities which were not media-related may be omitted.

Performing Arts Presenting Organizations

The Buffalo Fine Arts Academy. \$2,500 for artist fees for performances by the Nikolais Dance Theatre, the S.E.M. Ensemble (experimental electronic, instrumental and audiovisual works), and the Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra (a new work by Lukas Foss to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the Albright-Knox Art Gallery)

.

Performing Arts Dance

Mimi Garrard Dance Theater Company, New York City. \$1,500 for administrative expenses and fees for dancers and stagehands for a dance-theatre-media concert at Stony Brook.

Video Exchange, New York City. \$7,500 for editing and marketing tapes of performances by thirty-eight different dancers and dance companies.

Performing Arts Theater

The Jugglers, New York City. \$2,500 for production expenses for a series of performances of a multimedia work for children, and for development of a new work.

The Touchstone Center for Children, New York City. \$2,700 for production expenses for the completion of *Dream Project*, a participatory theatre piece for children combining improvisation, poetry, artwork and film.

Special Programs

Special Programs was developed by the Council in response to assistance requests from arts organizations serving predominantly black and Puerto Rican audience groups. In 1967, when the Council first allocated funds for such purposes, an emergency situation had been recognized in ghetto areas, where expression was either undeveloped or stilled. Service agencies tended to look at the first ghetto arts programs as "cooling" devices, but the talent and artistic expression that emerged from them soon made a real impact on the broader culture. Now the experience gained as Special Programs helped ghetto culture come into its own has also started to find application within the larger society.

Special Programs has not only encouraged professional black, Puerto Rican, Asian-American, and American Indian artists to practice and exhibit their art, although that has been a large part of its accomplishment. Concurrently, it has worked to develop the cultural resources of ghetto communities through nonprofessional participation in the creative processes that relate art to the everyday life of the ghettos. More recently the techniques developed in this latter sphere of activity have been used to liberate frustrated voices in other cultural communities previously thought to be barren. Special Programs activities for 1971-72 remained strong in the black and Puerto Rican neighborhoods, but it extended itself to also encompass rural towns, Indian reservations, suburban areas, migrant camps, hospitals, prisons, and other ethnic communities as well. One major vehicle for providing seed grants for the development of arts resources within isolated cultural communities - now organized as The Isolated Communities Program - is administered by The America the Beautiful Fund of New York under matching funds from the

Council and the National Endowment for the Arts. The activities of this program are reported separately at the end of other Special Programs grant listings.

The past year witnessed impressive growth of community-based arts organizations emerging throughout the State with Special Programs assistance. Because these are often unique regional resources they tend to serve and mirror a complex of cultural demands so that a single organization may sponsor street theatre and operate mobile units in dance, sculpture, and film. A new kind of multi-arts community artist has developed within several such groups with Special Programs encouragement. With full professional stature and broad artistic recognition in hand, these artists maintain their community ties and put their abilities to work variously in the interest of community expression.

One further 1971-72 Special Programs development merits special attention here - the recognition of cooperative arts efforts within black and Puerto Rican communities. Typical of these were the theatre festival sponsored by the Black Theatre Alliance and a dance festival sponsored by The Manhattan Theatre Club. Many of the participating groups, which originated with the sole support of the Council, have gone on to find financial assistance elsewhere in relation to their established worth. Special Programs continues to contribute to such groups by paying for specific public performances.

- Donald Harper

Amas Reportory Theater, Bronx. \$17,000 for administrative and production expenses for this multiracial theatre company which provides workshop instruction in music, dance, drama, filmmaking and playwriting.

A.P.S. Creative Arts Center, Buffalo. \$15,000 for free workshops in drawing, painting, graphic design, photography, and film at the Langston Hughes Center for the Visual and Performing Arts.

Arts Inc., New York City. \$15,000 for workshops in drama, dance, music, printmaking, calligraphy, graphic design and reproduction, still photography, and filmmaking for teachers, students and community workers in Lower Manhattan.

Black and White Action, Williamsville. \$7,500 for production expenses for a black literature seminar, a jazz festival for youth, a movie festival and three dramas presented in the Buffalo inner city and suburbs.

Cultural Council Foundation, New York City. \$50,500 for operating costs of a black film festival presented without charge at locations throughout the five boroughs of New York City. (excerpted).

Global Village Video Resource Center \$5,000 for operating costs of a program of video instruction for community groups.

The Solomon Guggenheim Museum, New York City. \$10,000 matching funds for fees of instructors for a program of free professional instruction in art, dance, filmmaking, music, theater, photography and graphics for approximately one hundred inner city children.

Hamilton Hill “Drop-in” Arts and Crafts Center, Schenectady. \$14,000 for arts, crafts and film workshops; and for trips and summer programs.

Special Programs Isolated Communities Program

American Life Foundation, Watkins Glen. \$1,500 for a community art center, a weaving workshop, a film festival and local crafts exhibits.

Bellevue Hospital Center, New York City. \$600 for a workshop in elementary and intermediate printmaking; and \$1,020 for a photography and video workshop.

Center for the Arts at Ithaca. \$1,920 to produce a series of cable TV programs on local history and culture.

Friends of the East Islip Public Library. \$1,500 to record the history of the area by audio- and videotapes of senior citizens.

North Country Cultural Center, Warrensburg. \$5,000 for workshops in photography, video and visual arts for children and adults, and for special events to involve more people in creative activities.

Ogdensburg Public Library. \$1,500 for a tape and film workshop to record the historical and cultural relationship between the town and the St. Lawrence River.

Visual Arts: Community Projects

Media Bus, Lanesville. \$12,420 for administrative expenses and materials for introducing historians, designers, planners and architects to video methodology.

The Meadow Lane Players, Brookhaven. \$6,000 for operating costs of a summer program of experiments involving marionettes, puppets and videotape, and performances in central Long Island shopping and community centers.

Regional Economic Community Action Program, Middletown. \$8,700 for operating costs of the Live Arts program of film, crafts, theater and art workshops.

Visual Arts

The Farmer’s Museum, Cooperstown. \$56,890 for a summer seminar of mixed media techniques for teachers, media specialists, local historians and museum personnel to develop exhibitions about local environment;

Visual Arts Community Projects

Media Bus, Lanesville. \$12,420 for administrative expenses and materials for introducing historians, designers, planners and architects to video methodology.

The Elaine Summers Experimental Intermedia Foundation, New York City. \$3,000 for production expenses, including professional fees for a multimedia environmental event at the Seagram Building in New York City, coordinated by dancer Marilyn Wood.

Visual Arts Visiting Artists

“...Fifty-six artists and critics made 75 visits to 28 organizations in 1971-72. In addition, the Visiting Artists program cooperated with the Office of University-Wide Services of the State University of New York in a program which enables students throughout the State to visit artists’ studios and galleries in New York City. Jan van der Marck, curator and critic, arranged for such Art Scene visits with Ivan Karp, Alex Katz, Tom Lloyd, Meredith Monk, Nam June Paik, Robert Smithson, Bernar Venet and Tom Wesselmann.” Excerpted.

Receipts and disbursements of funds, three-year period ended March 31, 1972

	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
Funds received			
New York State			
State Purposes	\$2,206,474	\$ 2,116,015	\$ 1,340,386
Local Assistance		18,000,000	13,000,000
Miscellaneous	50,000	17,178	
Total New York State appropriations	\$2,256,474	\$20,133,193	\$14,340,386
U.S. Government			
National Endowment for the Arts grant	36,363	75,377	101,320
Total funds received	\$2,292,837	\$20,208,570	\$14,441,706
Funds encumbered			
Personal service	\$ 333,599	\$ 852,854	\$ 853,423
Maintenance and operation	222,875	282,070	486,963
Total administrative cost	\$ 556,474	\$ 1,134,924	\$ 1,340,386
Grants, Aids, and Subsidies			
Arts Service Organizations		771,058	870,390 (1)
Film, TV/Media, Literature	65,000	1,575,625	1,316,950
New York Public Library		2,300,000	
Performing Arts	601,363 (2)	7,387,423(2)	5,408,475
Special Programs	345,000	2,024,447	1,789,866
Technical Assistance	100,000	87,325	199,360
Visual Arts	625,000	4,927,768	3,516,279
Total Grants, Aids, and Subsidies	\$1,736,363	\$19,073,646	\$13,101,320
Total funds encumbered	\$2,292,837	\$20,208,570	\$14,441,706
(1) Includes funds granted the New York Foundation for the Arts. In 1971-72 the Foundation received a Council grant of \$370,000 as shown in the Arts Service Organizations section of this report. The \$370,000 was allocated to specific Council programs and is reported as follows: Arts Service Organizations: \$45,000; Performing Arts (Touring Program) \$75,000; Special Programs \$75,000; Technical Assistance \$100,000; Visual Arts (Exhibitions) \$75,000.			
(2) Includes grant from the National Endowment for the Arts			